

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

### **Specification**

The Office Action alleges that the application contains a computer program listing and requires Applicant to reposition the computer program listing after the detailed description of the invention but before the claims. The Office Action fails to identify the pages of the application that allegedly contain a computer program listing. Applicant presumes that the Office Action is referring to the description of the System.Data namespace that begins on page 24 of the application. This description of the System.Data namespace is not a computer program listing. Instead, the System.Data namespace contains classes used to build components to manage data from various data sources. Further, the System.Data namespace provides tools to request, update, and reconcile data. This description of the System.Data namespace contained in the application is not a computer program listing. The System.Data namespace description contained in the application is not executable code and cannot be compiled into executable code. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the positioning of the description of the System.Data namespace in the application is proper.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Office Action alleges that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action rejects claims 1-13 and 22-31 as being directed to non-functional descriptive material. Claim 1 has been amended to specifically recite the functionality that is facilitated by the namespaces. Additionally, claims 22-31 have been amended to recite a computer-implemented method. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended claims are directed to statutory subject matter.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §101 rejections be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-13 and 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites an application program interface embodied on one or more computer readable media. Claim 1 has also been amended to specifically recite the functionality that is facilitated by the namespaces. Applicant submits that amended claim 1 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 22-31 have been amended to recite a computer-implemented method. Applicant submits that amended claims 22-31 clarify that the claims are directed to a process performed by a machine.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejections be withdrawn.

## **35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-23 and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,442,548 to Balabine et al. (hereinafter "Balabine"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-23 and 25-29 are patentable over Balabine.

Balabine discloses:

Information in a database is accessed with a computer system by transforming a file system request from an application into a database query and retrieving information corresponding to the database query from the database. The retrieved information is made available to the application as a file system object, for example, as a directory, a file, a link or a collection thereof. Balabine Abstract.

Thus, Balabine discusses a system that transforms a file system request into a database query and retrieves information corresponding to the query.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 of the present application is not anticipated by Balabine. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

An application program interface embodied on one or more computer readable media, comprising:

a first namespace related to data shared by a plurality of data providers;

a second namespace related to data used in an object-oriented database;

a third namespace related to data used by an SQL client;

a fourth namespace related to native data types within an SQL server; and

wherein the namespaces support managing data from various data providers.

The Balabine reference fails to disclose “a fourth namespace related to native data types within an SQL server” as recited in claim 1. The Office Action alleges support for this portion of claim 1 at column 2, lines 15-48 of Balabine. The cited language discusses “database unaware” application programs. However, the cited language fails to disclose any namespace related to native data types within an SQL server. In particular, the cited language fails to mention SQL servers or anything related to SQL servers. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Balabine fails to disclose all elements of claim 1.

Furthermore, the Balabine reference fails to disclose an application program interface containing the four namespaces recited in claim 1. The portions of Balabine cited in the Office Action discuss various functions, several of which are discussed in the Background portion of Balabine. However, the cited portions of Balabine do not disclose a single application program interface containing the four namespaces identified in claim 1.

Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 1 of the present application is not anticipated by Balabine. Given that claims 2-3, 6-10 and 12-13 depend from claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Balabine for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 14 recites:

An application program interface embodied on one or more computer readable media, comprising:

a first group of services related to sharing data among a plurality of data providers;

a second group of services related to using data in an object-oriented database;

a third group of services related to data used by a database client;  
and

a fourth group of services related to data types used by a database server.

The Balabine reference fails to disclose “a fourth group of services related to data types used by a database server” as recited in claim 14. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Office Action alleges support for this portion of claim 14 at column 2, lines 15-48 of Balabine. The cited language discusses “database unaware” application programs. However, the cited language fails to disclose a group of services related to data types used by a database server. In particular, the cited language fails to mention services related to data types. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Balabine fails to disclose all elements of claim 14.

Furthermore, the Balabine reference fails to disclose an application program interface containing the four groups of services recited in claim 14. The portions of Balabine cited in the Office Action discuss various functions, several of which are discussed in the Background portion of Balabine. However, the cited portions of Balabine do not disclose a single application program interface containing the four groups of services identified in claim 14.

Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 14 of the present application is not anticipated by Balabine. Given that claims 15-21 depend from claim 14, applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Balabine for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 22, as amended, recites:

A computer-implemented method comprising:  
creating a common namespace related to data shared by a plurality of data providers;  
creating an object-oriented namespace related to data used in object-oriented databases;

creating an SQL client namespace related to data used by SQL clients; and

creating an SQL types namespace related to native data types in an SQL server.

The Balabine reference fails to disclose “creating an SQL types namespace related to native data types in an SQL server” as recited in claim 22. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Office Action alleges support for this portion of claim 22 at column 2, lines 15-48 of Balabine. The cited language discusses “database unaware” application programs. However, the cited language fails to disclose an SQL types namespace related to native data types in an SQL server. In particular, the cited language fails to mention an SQL server or any data types associated with an SQL server. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Balabine fails to disclose all elements of claim 22.

Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 22 of the present application is not anticipated by Balabine. Given that claims 23-25 depend from claim 22, applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Balabine for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 22.

Claim 26, as amended, recites:

A computer system including one or more microprocessors and one or more software programs, the one or more software programs utilizing an application program interface to request services from an operating system, the application program interface including separate computer-executable commands to request services consisting of the following groups of services:

a first group of services related to sharing data among a plurality of data providers;

a second group of services related to utilizing data stored in an object-oriented database;

a third group of services related to data used by a database client; and

a fourth group of services related to data types used by a database server.

The Balabine reference fails to disclose “a fourth group of services related to data types used by a database server” as recited in claim 26. As discussed above, Balabine fails to disclose a group of services related to data types used by a database server. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Balabine fails to disclose all elements of claim 26.

Furthermore, the Balabine reference fails to disclose an application program interface containing the four groups of services recited in claim 26. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 26 of the present application is not anticipated by Balabine.

Claim 27, as amended, recites:

A computer-implemented method comprising:  
managing network and computing resources for a distributed computing system; and  
exposing a set of functions that enable developers to access the network and computing resources of the distributed computing system, the set of functions comprising first functions to facilitate data sharing, second functions to facilitate accessing object-oriented databases, third functions to facilitate SQL client operations, and fourth functions to facilitate SQL server operations.

The Balabine reference fails to disclose “exposing a set of functions that enable developers to access the network and computing resources ... the set of functions comprising ... third functions to facilitate SQL client operations, and fourth functions to facilitate SQL server operations.” as recited in claim 27. The Office Action alleges support for this portion of claim 27 at column 2, lines 1-14, column 6, lines 48-67, and column 7, lines 1-12 of Balabine. The cited language at

column 2, lines 1-14 makes a brief reference to writing "a SQL program", but fails to mention functions that facilitate SQL client operations or SQL server operations. The cited language at column 6, lines 48-67 discusses various file system operations, but fails to mention functions that facilitate SQL client operations or SQL server operations. The cited language at column 7, lines 1-12 continues the discussion of file system operations, but fails to mention functions that facilitate SQL client operations or SQL server operations. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Balabine fails to disclose all elements of claim 27. As such, Applicant submits that claim 27 of the present application is not anticipated by Balabine.

Claim 28, as amended, contains limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Balabine fails to disclose all elements of claim 28 for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 27. Given that claims 29-31 depend from claim 28, applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Balabine for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4, 5, 11, 24, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balabine in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,418,448 to Sarkar (hereinafter "Sarkar"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 5, 11, 24, 30 and 31 are patentable over Balabine in view of Sarkar.

Sarkar discloses:

The present invention provides a system for navigation through multiple documents in Extensible Markup Language and Resource Description Framework to inspect data/metadata in order to either start a transaction on selected item(s) in separate thin client window(s) with persistent connectivity through Internet Inter ORB Protocol or implicitly trigger read-only queries in Structured Query Language (SQL) represented in Resource Description Framework against a unified virtual Database defined over multiple physical disparate object relational databases over the web. Sarkar Abstract.

Applicant submits that Sarkar fails to remedy the deficiencies of Balabine discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of Balabine and Sarkar fail to disclose or suggest all elements of claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 5 and 11, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over Balabine in view of Sarkar.

Regarding claim 24, Applicant submits that Sarkar fails to remedy the deficiencies of Balabine discussed above with respect to claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of Balabine and Sarkar fail to disclose or suggest all elements of claim 22. As such Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24, which depends from claim 22, is allowable over Balabine in view of Sarkar.

Regarding claims 30 and 31, Applicant submits that Sarkar fails to remedy the deficiencies of Balabine discussed above with respect to claim 28. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of Balabine and Sarkar fail to disclose or suggest all elements of claim 28. As such Applicant respectfully

submits that claims 30 and 31, which depend from claim 28, are allowable over Balabine in view of Sarkar.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

Claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 6-07-04

By:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Steven R. Sponseller  
Reg. No. 39,384  
(509) 324-9256